

Accelerating universe emergent from the landscape

Jian-Huang She

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Academia Sinica

P. O. Box 2735, Beijing 100080

`jhshe@itp.ac.cn`

We propose that the existence of the string landscape suggests the universe can be in a quantum glass state, where an extremely large viscosity is generated, and long distance dynamics slows down. At the same time, the short distance dynamics is not altered due to the separation of time scales. This scenario can help to understand some controversies in cosmology, for example the natural existence of slow roll inflation and dark energy in the landscape, the apparent smallness of the cosmological constant. We see also that moduli stabilization is no longer necessary. We further identify the glass transition point, where the viscosity diverges, as the location of the cosmic horizon. We try to reconstruct the geometry of the accelerating universe from the structure of the landscape, and find that the metric should have an infinite jump when crossing the horizon. We predict that the static coordinate metric for dS space breaks down outside the horizon.

Jan, 2007

1. Introduction

Recently it was found that a large number of metastable dS spaces can be constructed in string theory [1] [2]. And subsequently the universality and importance of this phenomenon was realized and the concept of landscape was coined in [3]. A set of fields and a potential was assumed to describe the string theory vacua, and the space of these fields was named landscape [3]. Currently there is still wide gap between landscape and the real world.

It is often assumed that one vacuum is selected from the landscape, which then serves as the playground for the excitations. The vacuum is characterized by the dimension of spacetime, a cosmological constant, the matter content, the rank of the gauge group etc.. Then the question comes about the selection rule of the vacuum. Statistical surveys of the landscape were explored by some groups (see [4] and references therein), where the number distribution of vacua was discussed, and many observable effects, such as the scale of SUSY breaking, the gauge group, the matter content, can be estimated. Anthropic principle was invoked to explain why we are in such a vacuum [3], and quantum cosmology was also reformed to do this [5].

In this short note we advocate an alternative view that some characteristics of the vacuum of our real world, for example the smallness of the cosmological constant, result from the collective dynamics of the whole landscape. In black hole physics, the fuzzball idea was proposed to explain the information puzzle [6], where the apparent unique geometry with a horizon was deconstructed as the superposition of many smooth geometries with given global charge. In the context of AdS/CFT, this idea was more explicitly realized [7] due to the construction of all the half-BPS geometries [8]. There the smooth geometries act as spacetime foam, and a general probe is not sensitive to the details of the foam. A universal description of the low energy physics is the effective singular geometry. This idea actually provides a connection between the many microscopic vacua and the apparent vacuum, replacing the vacuum selection rules.

Here we generalize the idea to the nonsupersymmetric landscape and propose that the vacuum of our universe with small positive cosmological constant is an effective description of the low energy physics of the landscape. The effects of the spacetime foam can be encapsulated by an effective viscosity, whose existence signals the slowing down of the large distance dynamics. The vacuum is effectively treated as a medium with internal structure and the viscous flow is a cooperative behavior of the internal degrees of freedom. So

we are effectively introducing a hydrodynamic theory for the vacuum. In fact at finite temperature in the quark gluon plasma state, the large distance, long time dynamics of gauge theory is also described by a hydrodynamic theory, where shear and bulk viscosities are also used to characterize the transport properties of the medium.

In a local rest frame, where the three-momentum density vanishes $T_{0i} = 0$, the stress tensor of a medium with diffusive viscosity generally has the form

$$T_{ij} = \delta_{ij}p - \eta(\partial_i u_j + \partial_j u_i - \frac{2}{3}\delta_{ij}\partial_k u_k) - \zeta\delta_{ij}\partial_k u_k, \quad (1.1)$$

where p is the pressure, u_i the flow velocity, and η and ζ are the shear and bulk viscosities. T_{ij} is the spatial component of the energy momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$. The shear viscosity η characterizes the diffusive relaxation of transverse momentum density fluctuations, and the bulk viscosity ζ characterizes the departure from equilibrium during a uniform expansion. The bulk viscosity ζ vanishes for a scale invariant theory.

We draw analogy from the supercooled glass forming liquids, where a potential energy landscape was also discovered [9] [11]. The defining property of the glass transition is the slowing down of the dynamics. On cooling, the characteristic time scale, eg. relaxation time and of the viscosity, increases by more than 15 orders of magnitude in a relatively small temperature interval. We note that in the cosmological setup, thermal fluctuations are replaced by quantum fluctuations.

The layout of the note is as follows. In section 2, we consider the three phenomenological motivations of our study. We will see that the controversies can be resolved all together by simply assuming the existence of a large viscosity, which slows down all the corresponding processes. We derive from the structure of the landscape the origin of the viscosity in section 3. And in section 4, we try to illustrate our cosmic fuzzball scenario by reconstructing from the landscape data the accelerating geometry, which is subsequently compared to the static coordinate metric of dS space. Section 5 includes some discussions of future directions. Recent discussions of the quantum landscape can be found in [12].

2. Phenomenological issues

The phenomenological motivation of our study is threefold, the cosmological constant problem, moduli stabilization and the initial condition for inflation.

Direct observation of the acceleration of the universe came from the supernova project [13], and many puzzles were brought out by their observations. The first puzzle is that

the universe is accelerating. The universal attractive force imposed by the matter and radiation predicts a deceleration of the universe. A possible source of the repulsive force is the zero point energy of quantum fields. Assuming this, there comes the second puzzle that the acceleration is much slower than any estimation employing quantum field theory. This is the widely realized cosmological constant problem, which is often asked as why the cosmological constant is so small. The deviation of the theoretical estimation from the experimental results is usually illustrated by the ratio of the energy density

$$\frac{\rho_V^{the}}{\rho_V^{exp}} \approx 10^{-120}. \quad (2.1)$$

Here we propose that the extremely small cosmological constant, or the extremely slow acceleration of the probe objects, such as the supernova, is a result of an effective extremely large viscosity experienced by these objects.

In a simple Newtonian model, consider that the cosmological constant provide a repulsive force and the viscosity a friction term

$$m\dot{v} = f_\Lambda - g(v), \quad (2.2)$$

where $g(v)$ is some function of the velocity v . If $g(v)$ is linear in v

$$g(v) = bv, \quad (2.3)$$

the acceleration is an exponentially decaying function

$$\dot{v} = e^{-\frac{b}{m}(t-t_0)}. \quad (2.4)$$

What's important is that the acceleration is now controlled by friction rather than by the cosmological constant term. And the question why the acceleration $\dot{v}$ is so small is converted to the question why the friction b is so large.

More precisely, consider a universe with matter whose energy density is $\rho = \frac{\rho_0}{a^3}$, and cosmological constant Λ , the Friedmann equation reads

$$\left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)^2 = \frac{8\pi G_N}{3} \frac{\rho_0}{a^3} - \frac{k}{a^2} + \frac{\Lambda}{3}, \quad (2.5)$$

where a is the scale factor and k the curvature in the Robertson-Walker metric

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t) \frac{d\vec{x}^2}{(1 + \frac{1}{4}k\vec{x}^2)^2}. \quad (2.6)$$

Mathematically the Friedmann equation can be looked upon as the equation of motion for a particle moving in one dimension subjected to the potential

$$V(a) = -\frac{4\pi G_N}{3} \frac{\rho_0}{a} + \frac{k}{2} - \frac{\Lambda}{6} a^2. \quad (2.7)$$

With large a , the cosmological constant term dominates and the expansion of the universe accelerates. When there is extremely large viscosity, the motion in the effective potential is greatly slowed down, and $\frac{\dot{a}}{a}$ becomes very small, which, for an observer who neglects the viscosity, will be ascribed to an extremely small cosmological constant. We propose that this is the origin of the apparent smallness of the cosmological constant.

In the study of string phenomenology, the stabilization of moduli [14] [2] is a requisite to get a realistic model, which has nevertheless proven to be quite difficult to achieve. However in the present approach, this is not necessary, since all long distance dynamics are slowed down.

The problem of moduli stabilization can be illustrated as follows. Compactify type IIB string theory to 4 dimensions, and consider the typical effective potential [15]

$$V(\phi, \rho, \psi) \sim e^{\sqrt{2}\phi - \sqrt{6}\rho} \tilde{V}(\psi), \quad (2.8)$$

where ϕ and ρ are normalized dilaton field and volume of internal space, while ψ represents other fields. The dilaton will rapidly go to $-\infty$, and the volume modulus to $+\infty$ due to the exponential factor $e^{\sqrt{2}\phi - \sqrt{6}\rho}$. So the 4 dimensional space will rapidly decompactify to 10 dimensions.

However if the motion in potential (2.8) is subject to large viscosity, the decompactification time scale will be much prolonged and this process will not be detrimental to model building. Thus moduli stabilization becomes unnecessary. In fact, the dS vacua with all moduli stabilized as constructed in [2] are also metastable and there it was only required that their lifetimes are long enough. Without need of moduli stabilization, we hope that building string phenomenological models can be much easier.

Here a problem of our mechanism arises. If the universe starts in a state with dimension more than four, it seems that it can stay high dimensional for a long time. We have to assume that the smallness of spacetime dimension, as well as the smallness of the rank of the gauge group, can be explained by some mechanism, in this or some other framework.

Another motivation of moduli stabilization is the hierarchy problem [14]. Randall-Sundrum's idea of generating hierarchy via redshift [16] was realized by Verlinde in string

theory [17], where D3 branes are placed on a compact manifold, and a warp factor is generated

$$e^{-4A} \approx \frac{4\pi g_s N}{\tilde{r}^4}, \quad (2.9)$$

with N number of branes, g_s the string coupling, $\tilde{r}$ distance from the D3 branes. $\tilde{r}$ has no potential to fix it, and to get a stable hierarchy, fluxes are added [14]. The resulted hierarchy of energy scale is controlled by the fluxes

$$e^A \sim \exp(-2\pi K/3Mg_s), \quad (2.10)$$

with K, M the fluxes. When time evolution of $\tilde{r}$ is sufficiently slowed down by large viscosity, one can get a stable hierarchy without fluxes.

With long distance dynamics slowed down, the slow roll inflation also becomes natural. Consider a nearly homogeneous scalar field ψ coupled to gravity with action

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \psi \partial_\nu \psi - V(\psi) \right]. \quad (2.11)$$

The energy density and pressure are

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\psi &= \frac{1}{2} \dot{\psi}^2 + V(\psi), \\ p_\psi &= \frac{1}{2} \dot{\psi}^2 - V(\psi). \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

If the scalar field motion is slowed down due to large viscosity, making $\dot{\psi}^2 \ll V(\psi)$, or $\rho_\psi \simeq -p_\psi$, the equation of state of ψ will approximate that of the cosmological constant. Thus inflation occurs. The stringent constraint on the form of the potential $V(\psi)$ is much loosed this way.

And the above mechanism applies equally well for the emergence of dark energy. The sole difference between the epoch of inflation and the epoch of current slow acceleration dominated by dark energy is the energy scale of the effective cosmological constant. Thus our mechanism can explain

- 1), why there exists dark energy,
- 2), why dark energy is so small.

But it is more subtle to understand inflation. The above mechanism provides the $w = \frac{P}{\rho} = -1$ matter that can drive inflation, but if the evolution of the scale factor a is also similarly slowed down as in the case of dark energy, there will be no sufficiently fast process like inflation. One way to solve this problem is to assume that the scale factor

behaves differently as the matter degrees of freedom. In the inflationary phase, the scale factor responds to the vacuum as if it is a perfect fluid, with very small viscosity, while the other degrees of freedom respond as if the vacuum is a glass. And the scale factor part also enters the glass phase when inflation ends and the universe goes through the epoch dominated by matter and radiation and gradually enters the current slow acceleration phase.

Actually the community of high temperature superconductors have witnessed the separation of degrees of freedom, the spin-charge separation, which says that the spin degrees of freedom in a medium can respond differently as the charge degrees of freedom in the same medium. In the study of quantum decoherence of the universe [18], the metric also behaves differently as the other degrees of freedom, such as the matter fields. The former plays the role of the microscopic object and the latter the role of the environment, whose presence results in the loss of quantum coherence. Quantum decoherence is also a dissipative dynamics, similar to the effect of viscosity.

A crucial requisite of the success of the above explanations of the three problems is that short distance dynamics remains the same, described by flat space quantum field theory plus general relativity with asymptotic Minkowski background. Here by short we mean non-cosmological, for example the physics on the earth, or in the solar system, where numerous experiments have been done to check the validity of the existing theories. We only modify the theory at the cosmological scale. However it is generally not easy to modify general relativity only at large distance. In the following we will show that in our framework, this is naturally achieved due to the separation of time scales. In the study of glass transition, the separation of time scales was interpreted by suggesting that molecular motions consist of anharmonic vibrations about deep potential energy minima and of infrequent visitations of different such minima [9], which is the prototype of the landscape scenario in studying the glass state.

2.1. A model for scalar field driven inflation

Now consider a viscous scalar field coupled to gravity. Assume that the potential energy density has the simple form $V(\psi) = \frac{1}{2}m^2\psi^2$. The energy momentum tensor in the presence of gravitation has the generally covariant form

$$T^{\mu\nu} = pg^{\mu\nu} + (p + \rho)U^\mu U^\nu - \eta H^{\mu\rho} H^{\nu\sigma} W_{\rho\sigma}, \quad (2.13)$$

where

$$W_{\mu\nu} \equiv U_{\mu;\nu} + U_{\nu;\mu} - \frac{2}{3}g_{\mu\nu}U_{;\gamma}^{\gamma} \quad (2.14)$$

and

$$H_{\mu\nu} \equiv g_{\mu\nu} + U_{\mu}U_{\nu}. \quad (2.15)$$

Here we follow the notation of Weinberg [10].

The dissipative terms vanish for a Robertson-Walker metric, so the Friedmann equation remains the same as the case without viscosity

$$H^2 + \frac{k}{a^2} = \frac{1}{6}(\dot{\psi}^2 + m^2\psi^2). \quad (2.16)$$

The equation of motion for the scalar field is modified by adding a viscous term besides the cosmological damping term

$$\ddot{\psi} + 3H\dot{\psi} + 2\eta\dot{\psi} = -m^2\psi, \quad (2.17)$$

where we set $M_{pl}^2 = 8\pi G_N = 1$. Since the viscosity η is expected to be large, the scalar field moves slowly while the scale of the universe grows rapidly. Subsequently, one has $\ddot{\psi} \ll 3H\dot{\psi}$, $H^2 \gg \frac{k}{a^2}$, $\dot{\psi}^2 \ll m^2\psi^2$, and the above two equations simplifies to

$$H = \frac{\dot{a}}{a} = \frac{m\psi}{\sqrt{6}}, \quad (2.18)$$

$$3H\dot{\psi} + 2\eta\dot{\psi} = -m^2\psi. \quad (2.19)$$

Combining these two equations, one gets the equation for ψ to be

$$\frac{\sqrt{6}}{2}m\psi\dot{\psi} + 2\eta\dot{\psi} + m^2\psi = 0. \quad (2.20)$$

And the scale factor turns out to be

$$a = a_0 \exp\left(\frac{1}{4}\psi^2 + \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3}\frac{\eta}{m}\psi\right). \quad (2.21)$$

The first term in the exponential factor comes from the cosmological damping term $3H\dot{\psi}$, and the second term from the contribution of the viscosity. Here we note that, compared to chaotic inflation, one does not need to assume the scalar field ψ to be initially large. Due to large η , even small changes in ψ will result in exponentially large expansion of the scale factor a . To get a reasonably large number of e-foldings, eg. $N \sim 60$, assuming the change in the value of the scalar field to be as small as $\psi \sim 1$, the viscosity is required to be no less than $\eta/m \sim 74$, which is easily satisfied. Thus the constraint on the initial conditions for inflation is now more loosed.

We note also that our mechanism shares the same merit as the chaotic inflation model that it is quite generic in the sense that it does not depend on the particular form of the potential.

2.2. A model for the small cosmological constant

Consider the universe driven mainly by a large cosmological constant, which comes for example from a slowly rolling scalar field. As mentioned above, we assume that after inflation, a new phase emerges where the scale factor is also subject to a large viscosity, so the Einstein equation is modified. The spatial component now has the form

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + 2\eta\frac{\dot{a}}{a} = -\frac{1}{6}(\rho + 3p) = \frac{\Lambda}{3}. \quad (2.22)$$

The Friedmann equation is also changed, but for an observer who disregards the viscosity will define the effective cosmological constant through

$$\left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)^2 = \frac{\Lambda_{eff}}{3}. \quad (2.23)$$

So the effective cosmological constant is related to the bare cosmological constant via

$$\frac{\Lambda_{eff}}{3} + 2\eta\sqrt{\frac{\Lambda_{eff}}{3}} = \frac{\Lambda}{3}, \quad (2.24)$$

or

$$\Lambda_{eff} = 3\left(\sqrt{\eta^2 + \frac{\Lambda}{3}} - \eta\right)^2. \quad (2.25)$$

In the next section, we will show that an exponentially large viscosity can be achieved, so the above equation can be expanded to be

$$\Lambda_{eff} \simeq \frac{\Lambda^2}{12\eta^2}. \quad (2.26)$$

Assume that the bare cosmological constant is of the Planck scale $\Lambda \sim M_{pl}^2$, and the viscosity of the form

$$\eta = M_{pl}e^{N_{cc}}, \quad (2.27)$$

to get the large hierarchy (2.1), the number of e-foldings for the cosmological constant is required to satisfy

$$N_{cc} \geq 68. \quad (2.28)$$

What's important here is that the form of the geometry remains the same as the case with a bare cosmological constant without viscosity, the Robertson-Walker metric with $a(t) = a_0 \exp(\sqrt{\Lambda_{eff}/3}t)$, so in leading order, our mechanism has the same phenomenology as the model with a small cosmological constant, thus consistent with current observations. However the naturalness of the smallness of the cosmological constant can be understood in this framework.

2.3. A model for the slowly-rolling moduli

Consider for example the volume modulus ρ with potential $V(\rho) \sim e^{-\sqrt{6}\rho}$. In the following, We disregard the influence of the other moduli and also ignore the numerical factors of order 1. So the equation of motion for ρ reads

$$\ddot{\rho} + \eta\dot{\rho} + e^{-\sqrt{6}\rho} = 0. \quad (2.29)$$

With large viscosity, one has $\ddot{\rho} \ll \eta\dot{\rho}$, and the time cost to move from ρ_1 to ρ_2 reads

$$\Delta t = \eta(e^{\sqrt{6}\rho_1} - e^{\sqrt{6}\rho_2}). \quad (2.30)$$

Restoring M_{pl} , the time cost for ρ to roll from $V(\rho) = 1$ to $V(\rho) = \frac{1}{2}$ is

$$\Delta t \sim \frac{\eta}{M_{pl}^2}. \quad (2.31)$$

To achieve a life time of the order the cosmological time scale $\sim 10^{10}$ years, the number of e-foldings needs to satisfy

$$N_{cc} \geq 140. \quad (2.32)$$

Other moduli can be considered the same way as above, and one can get the corresponding bounds for N_{cc} , which are of the same order as (2.32).

3. Slowing down in the landscape

In the following we focus on the question how the existence of the landscape leads to the slow dynamics and separation of time scales.

Some features of the string landscape were recently explored in [19]. BPS domain walls were found where the potential has more than one critical points, with and without barrier between them. The critical points may be AdS, dS or Minkowski vacuum, and they may be minima, maxima or saddle points. The importance of the decay of metastable dS space was emphasized in [19]. Besides the reversible transition between different dS vacua, it was noticed that the decay of dS space into Minkowski space or AdS space via bubble production is irreversible. And such irreversible channels of vacuum decay were interpreted in their framework as suggesting the existence of sinks for flow of probability in the string landscape.

Here we further assume some general characteristics of the string landscape parallel to the previous work [9] in supercooled glass forming liquids. First, we assume that there are a large number of minima in the landscape, and these minima may have varying depths. Various such vacua were found since the work of [14] [2] in the study of flux compactification [4].

Second, our universe is at or near a minimum of the potential. The excitations about the minimum are described by quantum field theory and also the Einstein-Hilbert action.

Third, quantum fluctuations make possible transitions between different minima. In [2] two transition mechanisms were discussed, the Coleman-de Luccia(CdL) bubble [21] and the Hawking-Moss(HM) instanton [22]. The former works when the potential energy barrier is narrow relative to its height. Otherwise the latter dominates the transition. Thermal production of membranes can also lead to transition between vacua with different cosmological constants [23] [1] [24]. Details of the transitions are not that important, but their time scales will have effect.

The fourth assumption is that quantum fluctuations are not very severe, or stated more precisely, average energy of zero point fluctuations $\hbar\bar{\omega}$ is smaller than or at most comparable to height of the potential energy barrier Δ

$$\hbar\bar{\omega} \leq \Delta, \tag{3.1}$$

so that the properties of the system will be dominated by long residences near local minima of the potential energy with rare transition events between the minima.

The viscosity is the time integral of the stress correlation function. In a glass state, the local stress fluctuations do not decorrelate in time, and this leads to large viscosity. In the notion of landscape, this comes from the fact that the system visits only a finite number of configurations with appreciable probability, which is characteristic of broken ergodicity [25]. With sufficiently large quantum fluctuations, all configurations in the landscape can be explored with appreciable probability. In this case, the stress correlation function goes to zero in the long time limit, and the system is in a perfect fluid state where ergodicity is restored.

The slow dynamics in a glassy state can be qualitatively understood as a result of the high dimensionality of the landscape [28]. As mentioned above [19], there are many critical points in the landscape, where gradient of the energy vanishes. A critical point is characterized by the number of negative eigenvalues of the energy Hessian

$$H_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial s_i \partial s_j}, \tag{3.2}$$

where s_i labels a configuration in the landscape. We call this number the index I of the point. The minima have $I = 0$, and the maxima $I = N$, with N the dimension of the landscape. And we assume generally that there are critical points of every index.

The landscape can be tiled into different parts with respect to these critical points. The set of points that will flow through gradient descent to a minimum are grouped into a basin of attraction. Points on the $N - 1$ dimensional border ∂_1 of a basin will be stuck on the border. The trajectories of these points will end in minima on ∂_1 , which have index $I = 1$, the saddle points. Thus ∂_1 is itself tiled into basins of attraction with borders of dimension $N - 2$, denoted as ∂_2 . And the process can be reiterated to get a series of borders $\partial_1, \partial_2, \partial_3, \dots, \partial_J$.

The key point is that in a high dimensional landscape, a random starting point in a basin will be very close to a border. The distance between two configurations can be defined as

$$D(a, b) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (s_i^a - s_i^b)^2, \quad (3.3)$$

and most of the volume of a basin is contained within a distance of $D \simeq \frac{1}{N}$ from its border ∂_1 [28]. And similar arguments work for $\partial_2, \dots, \partial_J$. While systems starting on ∂_J will be stuck at a critical point of index J , a randomly chosen system, which generally starts near ∂_J , will be trapped in the neighborhood of a critical point with index $I = J$, and the dynamics of the system are slowed down.

The slowing down mechanism can also be illustrated by considering a gaussian model, where the energy distribution of the minima in the landscape has an explicit functional form

$$\Omega_N(E) = \exp(\alpha N) \exp\left[-\frac{(E - E_0)^2}{\epsilon^2}\right], \quad (3.4)$$

where N is the dimension of the landscape, E_0 some reference energy, α and ϵ two parameters. Here we follow the notation of [29]. The configuration entropy defined as $\Sigma(e) = \ln \Omega_N(E)$, now reads

$$\Sigma(e) = N\left[\alpha - \frac{(e - e_0)^2}{\bar{\epsilon}}\right], \quad (3.5)$$

with $\bar{\epsilon} = \epsilon/\sqrt{N}$ and $e = E/N$.

A crucial input is the Adam-Gibbs equation [30] which establishes a relation between the viscosity and the configuration entropy. In our case where thermal fluctuations are replaced by quantum fluctuations, the equation has the form

$$\eta(\bar{w}) = \eta_\infty \exp\left(\frac{E_1}{\hbar \bar{w} \Sigma(\bar{w})}\right), \quad (3.6)$$

with η_∞ the infinite fluctuation limit of the viscosity and E_1 is related to the energy barrier. The viscosity diverges at the zero points of the configuration entropy, where

$$e_* = e_0 - \bar{\epsilon}\sqrt{\alpha}. \quad (3.7)$$

This is qualitatively easy to understand. When the configuration entropy goes to zero, there are less and less available configurations for the system to explore, and the dynamics slows down. In this simplified model, we can make precise the definition of the averaged zero point energy as

$$\frac{1}{\hbar\bar{w}} = \frac{d\Sigma(e)/N}{de}, \quad (3.8)$$

in analogy with the definition of temperature in statistical mechanics as $T^{-1} = dS/dE$. At the zero entropy points, the zero point energy is

$$\hbar w_* = \frac{\bar{\epsilon}}{2\sqrt{\alpha}}. \quad (3.9)$$

Thus the viscosity reads

$$\eta(\bar{w}) = \eta_\infty \exp\left(\gamma \frac{w_*}{\bar{w} - w_*} \frac{\bar{w}}{\bar{w} + w_*}\right), \quad (3.10)$$

where $\gamma = E_1/(\alpha N \hbar w_*)$. So when the magnitude of quantum fluctuations is at or near the critical value, the system will have divergently large viscosity. We call this state a quantum glass state to distinguish it from the glass states driven by thermal fluctuations.

The universe is expected to relax to a ground state, and the relaxation time has also the Adam-Gibbs form [30]

$$\tau(\bar{w}) = \tau_\infty \exp\left(\frac{E_1}{\hbar\bar{w}\Sigma(\bar{w})}\right). \quad (3.11)$$

Similar to viscosity, it reads

$$\tau(\bar{w}) = \tau_\infty \exp\left(\gamma \frac{w_*}{\bar{w} - w_*} \frac{\bar{w}}{\bar{w} + w_*}\right), \quad (3.12)$$

in the gaussian model. We see that that the relaxation time can be very large in contrast to an intuitive estimation.

Separation of time scales is in fact closely related to the largeness of the viscosity. The lifetimes of elementary excitations are essentially the relaxation times associated with shear and bulk relaxation processes [26]. For a relativistic field theory, the shear viscosity η has the form [27]

$$\eta = \lim_{w \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2w} \int dt d\vec{x} e^{iwt} \langle T_{xy}(t, \vec{x}) T_{xy}(0, 0) \rangle, \quad (3.13)$$

where T_{xy} is the xy component of the stress tensor, and

$$\langle T_{-k}^{xy}(0)T_k^{xy}(0) \rangle = V^{-1}G_\infty, \quad (3.14)$$

with G_∞ the high-frequency shear modulus. The long-wave limit of the lifetime of the transverse modes is connected with viscosity via [26]

$$\tau_1 = \frac{\eta}{G_\infty}. \quad (3.15)$$

And the long-wavelength limit of the longitudinal lifetime is similarly connected with the bulk viscosity. So in a glassy state with large viscosity, the excitations with frequencies low relative to τ_1 will be highly damped, and contributions to macroscopic properties coming from higher frequency excitations are well separated from those from lower frequencies [9].

From the landscape point of view, the short time dynamics is related to the intra-basin motion around a local potential energy minimum, while long time dynamics is related to inter-basin transitions. With decreasing quantum fluctuations, deeper energy areas will be explored but with lower degeneracy, thus decreasing configuration entropy, which signals the ordering of the system in the landscape.

4. Emergence of the geometry

We see from the Adam-Gibbs relation above that dynamics in the glass state are all slowed down by an exponential factor $\exp(-\frac{E_1}{\hbar\bar{w}\Sigma(\bar{w})})$, and this effect is in fact geometric, in the sense that it can be capsulated by multiplying time by a redshift factor

$$dt \rightarrow \exp(-\frac{E_1}{\hbar\bar{w}\Sigma(\bar{w})})dt. \quad (4.1)$$

When the configuration entropy $\Sigma(\bar{w})$ vanishes, the redshift factor goes to zero, and time is frozen. This is the defining property of the event horizon in gravitational systems.

Here we view the spacetime geometry as an emergent concept, and try to reconstruct the metric from the magnitude of the prolonging of time scales. The location of the horizon is where the glass transition happens. The appearance of a horizon signals the existence of thermal effects, and Hawking temperature can be defined as

$$k_B T_H = \hbar\bar{w}. \quad (4.2)$$

So the above derivation of the viscosity (3.10) and relaxation time (3.11) in the Gaussian model completely parallels those in the supercooled glass forming liquids. The Hawking temperature at the horizon is determined by the critical value of the quantum fluctuations, and subsequently the energy distribution of the minima in the landscape

$$k_B T_H^* = \hbar w_* = \frac{\bar{\epsilon}}{2\sqrt{\alpha}}. \quad (4.3)$$

Up to this point, we have established two results that glass transition happens at the horizon scale and local physics remains the same. Obviously they are viewed from the perspective of a static observer. And the specific characteristic of cosmic horizon is also well accounted for, where every static observer is attached with a horizon.

We will compare the static coordinate metric of dS space

$$ds^2 = -(1 - \frac{r}{l})dt^2 + (1 - \frac{r}{l})^{-1}dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) \quad (4.4)$$

with the above result. The cosmic horizon lies at $r = l$. In dS space, the Hawking temperature detected by a geodesic observer is connected with the dS radius l as

$$T_{dS} = \frac{1}{2\pi l}, \quad (4.5)$$

while the cosmological constant is

$$\Lambda = \frac{3}{l^2}. \quad (4.6)$$

The redshift factor in the Gaussian model is

$$f(T_H) = \exp(-\gamma \frac{T_H T_H^*}{T_H^2 - T_H^{*2}}), \quad (4.7)$$

and we identify $T_H^* = T_{dS} = \frac{1}{2\pi l}$. To get an energy hierarchy of order 10^{-40} , as in the case of the cosmological constant problem represented in equation (2.1), the tuning is much looser. The temperature is required to be in the range

$$\frac{T_H - T_H^*}{T_H^*} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-2}\gamma). \quad (4.8)$$

Assuming spherical symmetry, a metric can be reconstructed from the redshift factor with the form

$$ds^2 = -f^2(T_H)dt^2 + f^{-2}(T_H)dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2). \quad (4.9)$$

Hawking temperature T_H varies with radius r

$$T_H = T_H(r). \quad (4.10)$$

The radial direction can be viewed as holographically emergent from the hydrodynamics of the landscape, since every radial coordinate r can be identified by the corresponding Hawking temperature T_H through (4.10).

This metric is quantitatively very different from the dS space metric (4.4), which we view as the result of the fact that the gaussian model is oversimplified, but qualitatively they have many similarities. The limit $T_H \rightarrow T_H^*$ corresponds to $r \rightarrow l$, stating that a horizon emerges at the glass transition point. The limit $T_H \rightarrow \infty$ corresponds to $r \rightarrow 0$, which means that physics which happens at the scale smaller than the horizon scale is in the high temperature phase, with small viscosity and small redshift. As a first order approximation, we identify the redshift factor calculated from the gaussian model with that of dS space between these two limits

$$\exp(-\gamma \frac{T_H T_H^*}{T_H^2 - T_H^{*2}}) \simeq 1 - \frac{r}{l}, \quad 0 < r < l. \quad (4.11)$$

It may seem strange that the $r \rightarrow 0$ limit, which is locally Minkowski, has infinite temperature. We note that the locally Minkowski nature of the emergent spacetime is a result of the random superposition of the configurations in the landscape, and the infinite temperature signals the total randomness of the superposition. The geometry is not treated as a fixed background as in quantum field theory in curved space. This can also be roughly understood as that our universe is more like the part of the spacetime inside the black hole horizon, where temperature can certainly be very high. And the correspondence of the temperature T_H with the radial coordinate r is also a UV/UV connection in accordance with the result found by probing deep inside the black hole horizon [31], in contrast to the familiar UV/IR relation in AdS/CFT [32], where long distance in the bulk corresponds to high energy in the boundary.

More notable is the difference between the two metrics. The function $f(T_H)$ is not continuous at the point $T_H = T_H^*$, and there is an infinite jump from $+\infty$ to 0. The redshift factor $1 - \frac{r}{l}$ in the metric (4.4) changes continuously when r goes across the point $r = l$. We interpret this as a sign that the metric (4.4) breaks down outside the horizon where $r > l$. Since there is a phase transition at the horizon, the metric inside the horizon can not directly be continuously extended to the region outside the horizon, where a new glass phase appears.

5. Discussions

In this note, we studied the collective dynamics of the landscape, and find that large scale dynamics slows down while short distance dynamics remains the same as before. The warping generated in the glass state provides a natural mechanism for the accelerating universe to emerge from the inherent structure of the landscape. The slowing down effect can be used to understand the cosmological constant problem, the naturalness of the slow roll inflation in the landscape and the overshoot problem in string compactification.

We hope to find scenarios other than the anthropic principle to understand the nature of our universe. And obviously the scenario outlined in this note is rude and in its infancy. Many open questions are left behind. First we hope we can have better control of the landscape and reconstruct a more realistic geometry of the universe. One needs to go beyond the simple gaussian model, and hopping effects among the minima may also play an important role.

The second question is whether other quantities of our universe, for example the dimension of spacetime and rank of the gauge group, can also be understood in this scenario. Maybe we can reparameterize the question as why these two quantities are so small. In fact the cosmological constant is also a quantized number as these two quantities. To begin with, we may first make these quantities continuous.

Another approach to understand the glass transition is based on the concept of frustration. A simple example is the Ising spin model on a triangular lattice with antiferromagnetic interactions between nearest neighbor spins, where the spins can not minimize the energy of the system by merely minimizing all local interactions due to the tiling of whole space. Frustration leads to two long time scales, which can subsequently help to understand the hierarchy problem [33]. In the absence of frustration, there is the correlation length ξ_0 of the fluctuations. When frustration is turned on, the locally favored structure can not tile the whole space, and domain walls are formed. The typical size R_D of the frustration induced domain walls is another long length scale, and it is generally much larger than the correlation length ξ_0 . The redshift factor has the form

$$\ln f(T) \propto \left(\frac{R_D}{\xi_0}\right)^2 \frac{T^*}{T}, \quad (5.1)$$

and an exponentially large hierarchy is generated.

We speculate here that the competition between the local quantum field theory and the holographic constraint of the number of degrees of freedom results in a frustration.

This helps us to understand the difficulty of a longstanding problem of AdS/CFT, that is how to extract bulk local physics from the dual field theory. From the frustration point of view, the two are both fundamental, not that one can be derived from the other, and actually they are competing. It will also be interesting if we can explore the nature of cosmology from the view of frustration.

Acknowledgments.

We thank D. W. Pang for discussions that initiated this project. And we also thank M. Li and Q. G. Huang for valuable comments.

References

- [1] R. Bousso, J. Polchinski, JHEP 0006:006,2000, hep-th/0004134.
- [2] S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A. Linde and S. Trivedi, Phys.Rev.D 68(2003)046005, hep-th/0301240.
- [3] L. Susskind, hep-th/0302219.
- [4] M. R. Douglas, S. Kachru, hep-th/0610102.
- [5] H. Firouzjahi, S. Sarangi, S.-H. H. Tye, JHEP 0409 (2004) 060, hep-th/0406107; S. Sarangi, S.-H. H. Tye, hep-th/0603237.
- [6] O. Lunin, S. D. Mathur, Nucl.Phys. B623 (2002) 342-394, hep-th/0109154.
- [7] V. Balasubramanian, J. de Boer, V. Jejjala, J. Simon, JHEP 0512:006,2005, hep-th/0508023; P. J. Silva, JHEP 0511:012,2005, hep-th/0508081; P. G. Shepard, JHEP 0510:072,2005, hep-th/0507260.
- [8] H. Lin, O. Lunin, J. M. Maldacena, JHEP 0410:025,2004, hep-th/0409174.
- [9] M. Goldstein, J. Chem. Phys. 51 3728(1969).
- [10] Steven Weinberg, “Gravitation and Cosmology: Principles and Applications of the General Theory of Relativity”, 1972.
- [11] F. H. Stillinger, T. A. Weber, Phys. Rev. A 25, 978(1982).
- [12] B. Freivogel, L. Susskind, Phys.Rev. D70 (2004) 126007, hep-th/0408133; S.-H. H. Tye, hep-th/0611148; G.L. Kane, M.J. Perry, A.N. Zytchow, hep-th/0311152; G.L. Kane, M.J. Perry, A.N. Zytchow, Phys.Lett. B609 (2005) 7-12, hep-ph/0408169.
- [13] Supernova Cosmology Project (S. Perlmutter et al.), Astrophys.J. 483 (1997) 565, astro-ph/9608192; Supernova Search Team (Adam G. Riess et al.), Astron.J.116:1009-1038,1998, astro-ph/9805201.
- [14] S. B. Giddings, S. Kachru, J. Polchinski, Phys.Rev. D66 (2002) 106006, hep-th/0105097.
- [15] A. Linde, hep-th/0503195.
- [16] L. Randall, R. Sundrum, Phys.Rev.Lett. 83 (1999) 3370-3373, hep-ph/9905221; Phys.Rev.Lett. 83 (1999) 4690-4693, hep-th/9906064.
- [17] H. L. Verlinde, Nucl.Phys.B580:264-274,2000, hep-th/9906182.
- [18] C. Kiefer, Class. Quant. Grav. 4 (1987) 1369; J. J. Halliwell, Phys. Rev. D39 (1989) 2912.
- [19] A. Ceresole, G. Dall’Agata, A. Giryavets, R. Kallosh, A. Linde, Phys.Rev. D74 (2006) 086010, hep-th/0605266.
- [20] J. Kurchan, L. Laloux, cond-mat/9510079.
- [21] S. R. Coleman, F. De Luccia, Phys.Rev.D21:3305,1980.
- [22] S.W. Hawking, I.G. Moss, Phys.Lett.B110:35,1982.
- [23] J.D. Brown, C. Teitelboim, Phys. Lett. B195:177-182,1987; Nucl. Phys. B297:787-836,1988.

- [24] A. Gomberoff, M. Henneaux, C. Teitelboim, F. Wilczek, Phys.Rev.D69:083520,2004, hep-th/0311011.
- [25] P. Goldbart, N. Goldenfeld, Phys. Rev. A 39, 1402(1989).
- [26] R. Zwanzig, Phys. Rev. 156, 190(1967).
- [27] A. Hosoya, M. Sakagami, M. Takao, Annals Phys.154:229,1984.
- [28] J. Kurchan, L. Laloux, cond-mat/9510079.
- [29] G. Ruocco, F. Sciortino, F. Zamponi, C. De Michele, T. Scopigno, J.Chem.Phys. 120, 10666 (2004), cond-mat/0401449.
- [30] G. Adam, and J. H. Gibbs, J. Chem. Phys. 43, 139 (1965).
- [31] G. Festuccia, H. Liu, JHEP 0604 (2006) 044, hep-th/0506202.
- [32] L. Susskind, E. Witten, hep-th/9805114.
- [33] D. Kivelson, S. A. Kivelson, X-L Zhao, Z. Nussimov, and G. Tarjus, Physica A 219, 27 (1995).